

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332)  
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973)  
Chief, Criminal Division

CHAD M. MANDELL (ILBN 6286783)  
Assistant United States Attorney

150 Almaden Boulevard  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 535-5059  
Facsimile: (408) 535-5066  
Email: chad.mandell@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	No. 08-00488 JW
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
	)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM JULY
v.	)	23, 2008 TO SEPTEMBER 9, 2008 FROM
	)	THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
MARTIN TORRES-MARTINEZ,	)	CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. §
	)	3161(h)(8)(A))
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

The parties stipulate that the time between July 23, 2008 and September 9, 2008 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161, and agree that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Finally, the parties agree that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public, and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal

//

//

cases. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

DATED: September 3, 2008

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO  
United States Attorney

/s/  
CHAD M. MANDELL  
Special Assistant United States Attorney

/s/  
MANUEL ARAUJO  
Assistant Federal Public Defender

**ORDER**

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between July 23, 2008 and September 9, 2008 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161. The court finds that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Furthermore, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED:

---

HOWARD R. LLOYD  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE